

REMARKS

Referring to paragraph 3 of the office action, the terms “M1” and “M2” are described in paragraph 33 of the specification. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

The abstract, title, disclosure and claims have been amended to overcome the outstanding objections. Withdrawal is requested.

Claims 1-2, 8-11 and 17-18 stand rejected under § 103 on the basis of Shiba JP ‘084. Applicant traverses this rejection because Shiba does not disclose or suggest a front wheel electronic passenger car in which the rigidity of the rear wheels is greater than the rigidity of the front wheels, as in the present claims, as amended.

According to the present invention, the front wheel and the rear wheel are so designed so as to have different rigidities such that the rear wheel is greater in rigidity than the front wheel. With this feature, the vibration convergence of the rear wheel, which has much to do with the riding comfort in a front-wheel-drive passenger car, can be enhanced and the vibration which is transmitted from a rear tire to the car through the rear wheel can be more rapidly damped than before. As a result, the riding comfort of the front-wheel-drive passenger car can be improved.

In contrast to the above, the cited reference discloses a wheel set in which a front wheel is greater in rigidity than a rear wheel, and therefore, shows a relation of the rigidity of the front wheel and that of the rear wheel which is completely opposite the relation according to the present invention. Moreover, the object of the invention of the cited

reference appears to reside in improving such things as the traction force in climbing and the difficulty in steering performance due to understeer.

Accordingly, the cited reference cannot even remotely suggest the technical concept of the claimed invention that the riding comfort can be improved by making use of a rigidity difference between the front wheel and the rear wheel in the front-wheel-drive passenger car, as pointed out above.

Further, while it is requisite in the case of the cited reference that the front wheel is greater in strength than the rear wheel and that the rear wheel is lighter in weight than the front wheel, the present invention is characterized in that, in connection with the rigidity of the wheels measured with the method shown in Fig. 6, the rear wheel is greater than the front wheel. The cited reference does not teach that at all. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

For the foregoing reasons, applicant believes that this case is in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested. The examiner should call applicant's attorney if an interview would expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.

By 

Patrick G. Burns
Registration No. 29,367

December 21, 2007

300 South Wacker Drive, Suite 2500
Chicago, Illinois 60606
Telephone: 312.360.0080
Facsimile: 312.360.9315

Customer No. 24978